DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 648 EA 024 232

AUTHOR Seddon, Terri
TITLE Restructuring Australian Education and Revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe.
PUB DATE Jul 92
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of Comparative Education Societies (Prague, Czech Republic, July 1992).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Futures (of Society); *Politics of Education; *Revolution; Social Action; *Social Change
IDENTIFIERS Australia; *Educational Restructuring; Europe (East Central)

ABSTRACT

Offered as a guide to action in uncertain times, this paper reviews literature on Australian educational restructuring and recent revolutions in east central Europe. The questions asked in both sets of literature differ; however, those posed by the revolutions in eastern Europe have a more directional focus. The research questions posed by the eastern European literature are applied to an analysis of educational restructuring in Australia. The main argument contends that transformation, which lies at the core of the eastern central European social revolutions, is the key to contemporary politics of education. If Australian educational research is to act as a guide to action, an analysis of education in relation to social theory and to a sociology of transformation is necessary. Such research would both explain probable futures and postulate preferred futures toward which to work. (Contains 43 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Seddon
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED349648

Restructuring Australian Education and Revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe

Terri Seddon

Faculty of Education
Monash University
Clayton, Vic 3168

July, 1992

EA 024 232

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The paper considers literature on Australian educational restructuring and Central and Eastern European revolutions as a guide to action in uncertain times. Striking differences in the questions being asked are apparent in both literatures with the latter having a far more directional character in its focus on the transformation from a communist past toward an indeterminate future. The research questions from the Central and Eastern European literature are teased out and turned to an analysis of educational restructuring in Australia. The paper concludes by suggesting that if Australia research is to be a guide to action what is required is an analysis of education in relation to a social theory and sociology of transformation and a creative thinking of transformation. Such research would both explain probable futures and postulate preferred futures toward which we can work.

Key words

Social change	Revolution	Politics
Educational Policy	Educational reform	Social structure

Restructuring Australian Education and

Revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe

Education and training in Australia are currently undergoing quite major change. Its pace has accelerated considerably since the late 1980s when the federal government tackled educational reform as part of its strategy for economic reconstruction. The experience of living this rapid change is of disorientation. Traditional arrangements of schooling are overturned. Words no longer mean what they used to mean. Institutions seem to misbehave because they are dancing to new tunes. Right and wrong, good and bad seem to have been turned on their heads. Change is just happening too fast. And yet, despite the disorientation political action seems important. People sense that schooling has changed too much to just go back to the past.

In Central and Eastern Europe, since the late 1980s, there has apparently been major changes as the Soviet regime has withdrawn and then collapsed. The pace of change has been remarkable, as has the social dislocation and human suffering it has brought. There is also disorientation as institutions change, new practices are demanded and new values and priorities emerge. One pressure is for pluralist democracy. There is a concern to generate political action which would begin to reconstitute civil society to shore up social order as the agencies of state socialist planning and the command economy are reorganised.

Australian education and Europe are at a crossroads. In Australia it is termed 'restructuring'; in Central and Eastern Europe some term it 'revolution'. The critical issue is which way we move on, beyond the present restructuring/revolution. This context of an indeterminate present demands political action, but instead, for most people there is uncertainty and political passivity (Kolarski-Bobinska, 1990). Instead

political action is left to those few who are excitedly involved in re-forming sites for social life.

In both locations, there are few guides to action. Politics rules, butressed by the constitution of interests as political forces. What becomes critical is the access people have to ways of seeing the world which can both project probable futures and open up preferred futures as a basis for grounded 'strategic action'.

One source of of such perspectives is the research literature. Its published forms are only very attenuated interventions into practical politics, but they do replay events so that participants can get a sense of where they are up to, what needs to be done and how tackle it all. What is striking is the differences between the Australian education restructuring literature and the literature on the European revolutions.

In Australia the most striking emphasis is on just keeping up with the information flow, documenting the cutting edge of debate and change in analyses which are overwhel*mingly* concerned with 'now'. 'Now' is sometimes taken to be the most recent stage of debate. At other times it is focused on the ten year term of the federal Labor government. Education restructuring which occurred in the US and UK under conservative governments is being replayed here under a social democratic party which has traditionally 'represented the working class'. It raises questions about Australia's and Labor's difference from the US and UK and their conservative governments. It raises fears in Australia about the prospect of a conservative Liberal government pushed further to the right by the rightist trend of Labor.

The overwhelming impression of the Australian secondary literature is that the breathless pace of restructuring is being replayed on paper with breathless, detailed accounts of recent developments and trends. There are critical insights which give insights into what is being lost in the new developments and the unjust silences which spell hardship in the future. There are even explanations of restructuring in terms of the

nation-states efforts to shore up a national economy in a globalised world economy (Yeatman, 1990), the states contortions as it contends with contradictory crises of accumulation and legitimation (Lingard et al, 1992) and its moves to sidestep institutional pressures from the past (Lingard, 1991).

But what this literature fails to do is to give a broad picture which can provide a ready guide for action. The touchstones it offers are too abstract, notions such as social citizenship, to be a basis from which people can get a perspective on what is happening and what the alternatives the future might bring. If one asks 'what is restructuring' one is thrown back into the swirling details and debate. It is a world in which everything seems to be in flux and with no point of reference, all one can do is be swept along by the most recent currents.

The secondary literature on Central and Eastern Europe seems to be rather different[1]. Like the Australian research it is often detailed and concerned with current developments. It also attempts explanations drawing on many different theoretical perspectives. But running through it all is a very clear imperative.

What is at issue is **transformation**.

The Western press trumpeted 'the collapse of communism' and 'triumph of capitalism'. This purile imperialistic commentary, coming from the socioeconomic system experiencing its worst crisis since the 1930s, got one thing right. The old ways of state socialism, or stalinism, were dissolving and the struggle was to shape their renovation as new practices and a new social order.

By focusing on the processes of social transformation the European literature sets the problem of political action centre stage. There is social change, the difficulty is how to guide it from the past, through an uncertain present toward a preferred future. How is voluntaristic political action -- which can 'choose' inaction -- mobilised to build a better social life?

It is this clear sense of transition from a dissolving past into a renovating future which the Australian literature seems to have lost, or at least relegated to an implicit undertone of impatience or regret. With this loss of focus on the processes of transformation has come a loss of direction. Which way should we turn?

The purpose of this paper is to centre the process of transformation at the core of the social 'revolutions' of Central and Eastern Europe and the educational 'restructuring' of Australia. My major contention is that transformation, a process of breaking the fetters of the past and moving through political action toward an unknown future, is the critical dynamic in social and educational change. If we are to act with foresight, and therefore with effect, we need a social theory of transformation, a grounded sociology of transformation and a creative thinking of transformation as a guide to action.

The paper is organised in three parts. The first, briefly reviews some of the key insights about transformation arising from my limited reading of the Central and Eastern European literature. The second part considers these insights in relation to the current educational debate in Australia. Finally, I return to these more general themes in an argument about the nature of atheory of education.

Themes of transformation: Central and East European insights

The core theme of the European literature is of the centrality of transformation; the move from the past to an indeterminate and dangerous present in an historical dynamic towards an unknown future. A substantial part of this literature is concerned to simply document developments. But in most cases the analysis is used to address particular aspects of the processes of transformation. These studies suggest a series of questions which are significant in the analysis of transformation.

• What is the intended project of transformation?

As Suny (1991) argues, in the USSR the project was economic reconstruction. The Gorbachev strategy depended upon simultaneous: democratisation and neutralisation of the conservative apparat; a mobilisation of civil society, especially intellectuals, to critique the old and encourage popular movements for reform; and the initiation of economic and political reforms to erode the power of conservatives and institutionalise democracy. But this gameplan for revolution from above was hijacked by nationalist movements which reopened unanticipated debates about the relationships between and within post-Soviet republics. Clearly, intended projects for transformation open a Pandora's Box. They permit reform, but give rise to unintended outcomes which change practical politics in unanticipated ways. Intentionality is clearly an insufficient base for transformation.

• What is the past from which transformation departs?

Clearly the past in Central and Eastern Europe was 'communism', 'state socialism', 'stalinism', 'Real Socialism', 'totalitarianism'. But clearly too, the different conceptions of the past have a significant impact upon strategic action and contemporary practical politics. There are then three further relevant questions:

• How is the past understood?

• How is the past ideologised?

• What are its effects in practical politics?

As Walicki (1991) argues that demonising and mythologising the past as 'totalitarianism' means that the transition to a post-stalinist regime is too punctual. It appears as a total and unanticipated collapse which is explained in terms of charismatic individuals, for example by the Gorbachev factor, which 'permitted' the collapse or by local charismatic leaders who 'led' the revolution. Rather than such unrealistic individualist explanations, Walicki suggests that processes of 'detotalitarianism' must be

recognised. Such processes entailed a gradual rejection of totalitarianism. Instead of consenting, people liberated themselves from fear and indoctrination to form oppositional social movements which could struggle for collective self-determination. These social processes of withdrawing support and eroding legitmacy of the old regime were preconditions for the eventual collapse because they had already transformed totalitarianism into communist authoritarianism which marked the gradual reform of state power.

Walicki's analysis opens up two further questions, each resting upon rather different ways of seeing the process of transformation. The first depends upon the categorical demonising of the past:

*** If we are moving beyond the past, what should we jettison? what should we retain? What should be reformed and what transformed?**

Retaining a clear sense of where we have come from is crucial in debates about transformation toward a different future. In this sense constituting the past as a simple category with clearly defined characteristics or organising principles (Ziotkowski, 1990) which is easily grasped is an important political move. It is perhaps most critical in providing a sense of direction in practical politics. If we know the past in some way and know its positive and/or negative features, we have a point of reference from which to embark on struggles for the future. Without this touchstone, everything swirls and there is no basis for judging better or worse alternatives, or foreward or backward directions.

This political strategy has been used to effect in Chubb and Moe's (1990) Politics and Markets. They characterise the existing system of educational governance as the 'one best system'. This system, they argue, is an expression of unfree democratic principles which must be overturned in favour of a market model if schooling is to become more effective. They create a category, sloganise it neatly, articulate it with

negative evaluations of 'democratic politics' (also sloganised) and then attack it as a negative past which must be transformed in a positive future.

But the ideology of categorical conceptions of the past cannot be allowed to constrain and limit practice, either in thinking or acting. What is also necessary is a good grasp of the social, historical, political and economic dynamics which take a regime to the point of collapse and what finally pushes it over the edge. The key question is:

*** What are the preconditions for transformation?**

This question opens up a whole political economy, historical sociology of transformation because it calls for a total analysis of the collapsing regime. Walicki's (1991) analysis of the collective struggle for the 'subjectivity of society', the hegemonic state of play, is one dimension.

Another dimension is the economic and political collapse of the Soviet empire. The command economy was plunged into deepening crisis unable to provide the consumption needs of the civilian population and constantly undermined by the creaming off of resources for military expenditure and to butress the system of political privilege (Callinicos, 1991). In Poland through the 1980s, for example, falling wages and declining security of state employment encouraged the expansion of a second economy, but the capacity to participate in moonlighting was not universal. The trajectory as the private economy expanded, fuelled by foriegn exchange and aspirations for Western consumption levels, eroded the old logic of state provision. Private employment became better remunerated than state service. Dependence on the state reduced, especially amongst the state elites, and pressure for reform increased (Ziotkowski, 1990).

A further dimension in this sociology of transformation is the specific historical and social circumstances which, as traditions and ties with the past, underpin and shape processes of change. Nationalism has been a silenced tradition under stalinism and it is now breaking out as real force in practical politics. Other traditions were suppressed

under stalinism: religion, even, according to Callinicos (1991) the authentic revolutionary movement of Bolshevism. What we now see is 'the revenge of history' (Callinicos, 1991). Processes of class formation and the historical formation of cultures have also become significant as moves to democratic pluralism encourage the formation of interest groups as political forces.

This analysis of the dynamics and trajectories of history are fundamental to an assessment of the current context and particularly how practical politics are likely to shape the process and dynamic of change. Two further questions emerge:

*** What is the probable future?**

This question demands not just an analysis of social history and political economy, but a closer analysis of practical politics in order to identify the constraints on, the opportunities for, and the contradictions driving, transformation.

Kolarska-Bobinska (1990) identifies a contradiction in Poland: the need for political action in the reconstitution of civil society, but the simultaneous growth of political passivity. This contradiction leads him to question whether the probable future of a market economy and democracy will include an active civil society. He sees three major constraints: the heritage of the past and the legacy of 'Real Socialism'; the economic recession which constitutes the local conditions of the Polish transformation; and the state of anomy which rapid change has brought upon the Polish people. This last constraint entails factors such as questioning the definition of the past, present and future, and how one relates with the past, including one's own past. It also identifies the impact of changing social structure and 'declassation', changes in values and priorities, changing legal norms and their replacement by less obvious but more binding economic regulation, and changing moods of different social groups which are more likely to mobilise against reform than for it.

What is significant about this analysis is that it begins to make clear, not only the dynamics which underwrite transformation, but the particular opportunities and limits on political action. It enables the formulation of strategic action which can either support or counter the trajectory toward the probable future.

But there is another question:

*** What are preferred futures?**

A sociology of transformation, coupled with a detailed assessment of the opportunities and limits which circumscribe the politics of practice, provides a basis not just for strategic thinkging, but also for the 'thinking of transformation' (Petrovic, 1988). It enables a move beyond probable futres to a consideration of preferred futures. It raises questions about other social arrangements, the interrelation of social institutions and logics of social design (Kaviraj, 1984). Such thinking of alternatives is not just utopian flights of fancy because they are grounded in social history and are attentive to the constraints, opportunities and contradictions of practice. The envisioning of preferred futures rests therefore not just on optimism of the will, although this is important, but also on pessimism of the intellect (Gramsci, 1971).

These insights from the literature on Central and Eastern European revolutions can usefully add to our Australian analysis of educational restructuring. In the next section I use the questions of transformation to suggest an analysis of the contemporary Australian debate[2]

Educational restructuring in Australia

The intended project of transformation

The cutting edge of contemporary educational debate and reform in the middle of 1992 is the training agenda. It is not a single coherent agenda, but a broad program for socio-economic modernisation which different groups link with in particular ways[3].

The training agenda has been spearheaded by the peak union body, the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) and the federal Labor Party through the Accord. It has connected education and training to industrial relations and this has brought employers into a corporatist decision making structure focused on industry and award restructuring. The orientation of the training agenda has grown out of the demands of technocratic labour, converging with economic rationalism (Junor, 1988).

The framework for the training agenda is most clearly shown in Australia Reconstructed (ACTU/TDC, 1987), the report of a jointly sponsored ACTU and Trade Development Council mission to western Europe. This report analysed the context of Australia's balance of payments crisis and the globalisation of markets, and presented a program of economic reform which centred on industry and award restructuring. The document made a number of recommendations for macro- and microeconomic reform, advocating a corporatist, consensus based approach to managing Australia's economic crisis. The recommendations involve the negotiation and active pursuit of national economic and social objectives which aim to achieve 'full employment, low inflation and equitable increases in living standards'. These objectives are to be achieved by maximising economic growth and development through innovative tripartite management and increased productivity based on removing impediments to change.

Such consensual management rests upon maintaining a stable economic context through a prices and income accord, strategically guided trade and industry policies, measures to encourage productive investment and industry restructuring programs. These programs encompass firstly, an active labour market program which tackles unemployment, not through passive programs of minimalist cash transfer, but through actively promoting skill formation , effective job placement and reduced labour market segmentation. The second dimension of industry restructuring entails a reformed practice of work. It requires the promotion of a production consciousness and culture

which recognises that the 'creation of wealth is a prerequisite of its distribution' (ACTU/TDC, 1987: 156), and the reform of production by changing the interaction of skill formation, technology, work organisation, industrial relations, training and education. The emphasis is on 'harnessing the human factor to the quality and productivity challenge' (Dix, 185:6).

The emphasis on skills formation puts education and training at the heart of the project of economic reconstruction. The proposal is that education and training should be harnessed to Australia's economic reconstruction and restructured so that enhanced performance, rather than academic merit, becomes the key to flexible movement through educational and occupational pathways. Increased 'competence' is the mechanism governing educational and occupational mobility. The monitoring of skill formation through individual performance enables competence to be assessed, and allocated to appropriate tasks. The monitoring of national skill formation through skills audits and labour market demand would indicate industries and sectors where skills were needed and the kind of competencies required. Given appropriate programs for skill formation, credit transfer, award reform and competency-based job descriptions, no job or schooling would be terminal because retraining would allow horizontal and vertical movement through an integrated educational and occupational career structure.

This integration of schooling into work is focused particularly on the post-compulsory years because it is the 15-19 year old youth labour market which has collapsed most comprehensively (Freeland, 1986) The young unemployed are increasingly reconstituted as students as a result of government policy which has included removal of the dole for 15 and 16 year olds, changes to educational benefits such as Austudy, and the expansion of traineeships and other labour market programs. It puts a variety of new pressures onto institutions of education and training, but at base the critical questions concern:

1. how the retention kids should be distributed between schools, TAFE/training and higher education;

2. who will pay for the increased provision;

3. what the retention kids will do: what kind of curriculum and assessment will structure their participation in education and training.

The contemporary rhetoric of 'upskilling' and making Australia 'the clever country' is the froth and bubble of simpler questions of population management, occupational preparation and national skill formation for the 21st century.

The past from which transformation departs

The changes arising out of the training agenda appear as a major onslaught on education. It all seems to come from 'outside': from the broad economic, political and social restructuring of the external milieu; from the challenge of retention and from the pressure by federal politicians and bureaucrats, economists, unionists and employers to change the organisation of schooling.

But what is the taken for granted 'inside', the setting of schooling which we live as educators? What is it that constitutes the 'structural rigidities' which the training agenda contests?

The past would appear to be constituted by the institutional and discursive setting of liberal meritocracy, with its polarities of 'education' and 'training' and its organisation of 'education' as an educational ladder in an academic - non-academic dualism. Liberal meritocracy was institutionalised in the 1920s at about the time of the Russian revolution. It was the result of a class compromise[4] between the aristocracies of labour and the ruling class, which in Australia has never been aristocratic but profoundly middle class being based in mercantilism and administration.

Liberal meritocracy institutionalised education as an educational ladder. It established:

an enclave which:

* divorces 'education' from work;
* sets it apart from social life, employment and the family by institutionalising a selection of educational practices in schools for children, relegating the wider educational practices of social life to the world beyond schools;
* privileges 'education' through its institutionalisation of an educational ladder, linked to academic credentials and preparation for professional employment and protected by its primary guardians, the universities and the private schools, up which juvenille units of undifferentiated ability climb;
* simultaneously privileges formal 'training' as a separate enclave where another where another selection of educational practices, oriented to vocationally specific preparation, are institutionalised through technical education linked to apprenticeships and skilled employment and connected with its primary guardians, the predominantly male industrial labour movement and employers; and
* consequently disadvantages those who fall beyond the frames of academic learning and the skilled male worker because their learning is not privileged, but dismissed as informal learning, natural capacities, irrelevant leisure.

with boundaries which:

* comprise of legislation, organisational and administrative arrangments, regulatory principles and entrenched discursive and actual practice; and
* define 'education' as the educational ladder from kindergarten, through schools to higher education.

organised on the principle of equality of opportunity which:

* allows everyone to enter the race for educational and therefore occupational advantage;
* compensates for some gross differences in starting points, in the name of fairness; and

* treats reluctance to enter the race for competitive advantage as a sign of deviance which requires correction.

controlled by a government bureaucracy which:

* for each enclave -- education and training -- was expert, rooted in and constrained by the culture and practice of its guardians; and
* therefore protected class interests at the expense of others marginalised by the practice of this social division -- the unskilled working class, women, Koories, NSEB, the disabled.

structured by an academic non-academic polarity which:

* creates streams to different post-school destinations;
* differentiates those streams on a dimension of unilinear 'intelligence' which rested on the norming of an elite middle class culture;
* privileges the 'academic' in status and resources and residualised the 'non-academic' as a low status, poorly resourced sector for those acquiring basic skills and on their way out of education;
* simultaneously privileges the craft traditions of the skilled male worker and residualised the non-craft sector within technical education;
* constitutes a culture of failure in both sectors; and
* distortes the human competence of all students and created disadvantage and impoverishment which was confirmed in the world of paid and unpaid work.

and perpetuates a utilitarian curriculum which:

* privileges occupational preparation, for the trades or the professions, over other social purposes of schooling;
* polarises rigour and relevance, abstracted and practical knowledge, in an unhelpful way in order to maximise occupational gatekeeping;
* confirmes rigid educational and occupational streaming with little flexibility; and

* constitutes an anti-democratic social division of expertise.

The class compromise privileged a labourist working class, which was predominantly white, male, Anglo-Saxon and clustered in the productive sectors of the economy, and an intellectual middle class elite in public administration. It selected, organised and distributed an educational practice which was utilitarian in its concern with vocational preparation for, respectively, trades and the professions. The formalisation of these educational practices, as 'education' in 'schools' with its academic curriculum and pedagogy, and hierarchy of academic credentials, and as 'training' in technical education with its 'practical' curriculum and pedagogy, and apprenticeships, constituted protected routes into the labour market. It also institutionalised practices which served to preserve academic (Teese, 1981) and trade culture (Mealyea, 1989), ensuring the continued formation of ruling class, administrative and labourist working class aristocracies.

Ideologies of the past and practical politics

For those served by 'education', liberal meritocracy has been ideologised as 'liberal education', usually spoken with a slight but respectful pause and a sonorous tone. But 'liberal education' is a romantic ideology. Cultural conservative movements in the current educational debate are quick to assert the superiority of 'liberal education' as the only education of substance, of rigour and of standards. But this picture of a golden past and a threatened present butresses a conservative educational project which sees liberal meriotcracy as an acceptable basic pattern of school organisation. The ideology of 'liberal education' serves to maintain the educational status quo. All that is needed is some tinkering to adjust the dualist structure so that it accommodates the new retention kids in the postcompulsory years.

But there are large numbers of students who have not been served by liberal meritocratic 'education'. Those who did not belong to the 'education' and 'training' aristocracies were 'disadvantaged'. They include workers who are not in the productive

sectors, those marginalised in the labour market, the poor, Koories, NSEB and to a large degree, women. These students have lacked a protected route to the labour market and reserved sites within it. Schooling did not provide a mechanism for cultural preservation, but subjected them to a more or less alien culture, demanding their compliance with it or rejecting them from it. It did not legitimise their cultural and educational practices by formalising and credentialling them, but relegated them to the devalued status of informal education and leisure activities. Lacking an institutional means for constructing as distinctive identity and sense of difference, undermining their educational and occupational status, and thereby limiting their social standing and access to resources, these non-aritocratic 'others' were denied a voice and political clout. They have had to contest the structure of liberal meritocracy for access, for recognition of their educational and cultural practices in schooling and in work, and for an equitable share of educational resources: funds, time, space, attention.

In the 1970s, with the end of the long post war boom, economic vulnerability was felt most severely by those disadvantaged by the class compromise of the 1920s. Liberal meritocracy's enclaves of 'education' and 'training' served academic and labour elites well, through higher education -- the closed shop of the professions -- and apprenticeships -- the closed shop of skilled work. It did a disservice to those beyond the frames of the 'intellectually able' (and culturally privileged) and the skilled male worker. In an era of widespread cultural critque and political activism, these groups made public their grievances and mobilised to press their claim against and within the state.

The liberal progressive challenge to liberal meritocracy attacked the 'education' as irrelevant, individualist, authoritarian and elitist. It mounted a significant and convincing case about the way schools failed children. Liberal meritocracy stood accused of failing to truely educate and even to effectively school large numbers of students. It attacked the formula of liberal meritocracy. It went beyond questions of access to challenge and

redefine what counted as a 'student' and valid 'knowledge'. It began to democratise educational practice by for example, seeking inclusive curriculum and pedagogy and contesting the academic control and ethos which shaped schooling.

But ultimately the liberal progressive challenge to the hegemony of the 'academic' in the organisation of schooling was limited because it accepted liberal meritocracy as a framework within which reform could be effected. It did not question that education = schooling = the educational ladder, although it was felt that such 'education' should be more relevant to students' different experience and post-school destinations. It attacked the opposition of intellectual credibility and relevance at the heart of liberal meritocracy. But its pluralist student centred notion of relevance encouraged a weak, relativist view of knowledge. This could not contest the legitimacy of the academic curriculum, powerfully defended by the mobilisation of its cultural conservative guardians in terms of the relativist threat to standards and discipline. Nor could it stand against the counter criticism that relativist, experience based curricula were an alternative means of social selection and stratification (Kalantzis and Cope, 1992).

However, it was not just the 'disadvantaged' who suffered from the liberal meritocratic patterning of 'education' and 'training'. Ultimately, the labourist aristocracy did too, indicating the relative weakness of labour in the class compromise of the 1920s. Access to training was by way of schools at the lower levels of the academic educational ladder. Students were institutionalised within a setting which even at its junior ends privileged the culture and academic mores of 'education' defined by an administrative middle class aristocracy. Entry to training entailed academic failure, their rejection of, and by, academic educational practices and a voluntary or involuntary departure from school. Schooling institutionalised a culture of failure for these students . It established labourist educational and occupational routes as second class.

The subordination of technical to academic education and the latter's colonisation of schools as a preparation for higher education and the institutionalisation of failure as the entry requirement to training undermined the liberal meritocratic class compromise. While welfare capitalism lived up to expectations this eroded settlement was of marginal significance. But now, when times are tough and welfare capitalism has so demonstrably failed to maintain living standards, the aristocracy of labour has reopened the debate about an acceptable educational settlement. Significantly, it is driven from Victoria; the State with a long tradition of protected technical education and currently suffering most of all States in the recession.

The advocates of the training agenda now create their own picture of liberal meritocracy. It is contemptuous of its 'academic preciousness' and elitism, dismissive of its irrelevance to modern living and scathing about the distorting culture of failure that liberal meritocracy has created for so many students.

The preconditions for transformation

The circumstances within which the training agenda challenges liberal meritocracy are given by a rapidly changing external milieu, global and national economic, political and social restructuring. But even within liberal meritocracy there has been a gradual withdrawl of support until now there is widespread agreement that 'education' must be reformed, modernised, to make it relevant to the 21st century. This withdrawl of support has occurred through a succession of challenges mounted since the 1920s, but since the 1960s the challenges have gathered pace, pressing harder, each being more significant and fundamental than the last.

What is striking about the challenges to liberal meritocracy since the 1980s is the way they are overlain by economic rationalism. Economic rationalism is a tendency which integrates the tenets of classical liberal political theory, neo-classical economics and an administrative rationality which has been termed 'corporate managerialism'. It is

intensely individualistic, with a commitment to markets as the basis of social regulation. The state should be small, but strong, with an interventionist and centralised public administration guaranteeing the conditions for the full development of market relations. Corporate managerialism entails 'the replacement of public policy objectives couched in terms of social goods by public policy objectives couched in terms of economic goods'. The primary objective becomes 'fostering a competitive economy' (Yeatman, 1991).

Economic rationalism does not see 'education' as a quest for knowledge in a broad cultural sense, but as a process of economic production, producing human capital. Students are not learners, but investors in economic utility. Their motivation is seen to depend upon economic self-interest, that is, investment to augment their future wages. Teachers in this scenario, are not educational authorities or guides leading their students to full personal and cultural development. Rather, they are driven by self-interest, protecting themselves while serving students' investments, by supplying skills in a structured way.

This vision of education reduces society to 'the market', ignoring all aspects of society which are not defined economically. On the one hand, this tends to deny the significance of those aspects of society concerned with politics, decision making and citizenship, the social dimensions of communication and learning, and reproductive, nurturing and caring capacities. On the other hand, it pressurises these other social dimensions into economic forms which can exchanged and accounted for in market terms. Education therefore becomes preoccupied with exchangeable credentials and is judged on quantifiable measures.

The value of education is therefore seen economically, in terms of the private return on an individual's educational/economic investment and the national return on government funding. The value of education is a price, the individual's wage or increased national accounts arising from increased productivity.

Education which has no price, like free state schooling, is seen to have no value. But it registers as a cost in accounting procedures. A cost, with no benefits, means massive outlay for zero return. It follows, that state education and training is seen to be enormously inefficient. This characterisation fuels efforts to cut outlays, to offset state funds with funds from other sources, and to commercialise outputs so that they can assessed in standard accounting practices. The result is a preoccupation with quantifiable outputs and measures, and directly commercial activity. It also encourages a strong corporate managerialism which, like liberal political theory's sovereign, will regulate the quasi-market organisation of education and training in 'the spirit of the market' (Marginson, 1992:19). It presumes that market and non-market organisation is equally amenable to ordering within a market framework.

The corollary of the non-market, no value, low efficiency view of state education and training is an enhanced appreciation of private education and training which is already commercialised through fees and organised as a market. It is assumed that economic productivity and hence, efficiency, is maximised in a situation of free competition and exchange. The free market logic demands no state interference in the workings of the market; no artifical propping or adjustment of wages and no welfare provision which would detract from exchange. Private provision seem more efficient than state provision which is therefore discredited and devalued regardless of its actual performance. The result is an increasing residualisation of state provided education and training (Preston, 1984).

Economic rationalism challenges universal liberal meritocracy to its foundations. It redefines what counts as education and educational purposes in terms of economics. Students are redefined as being equal, as they are all assumed to invest in education. Social and educational inequality is assumed to be natural. As educational investment is seen to be a rational choice, compulsory schooling is logically unnecesary -- student self-

the preferred approach rests on voluntary contracts which mediate between different interests.

In Australia economic rationalism currently colours the whole educational debate. The concern with efficiency (producing output for minimum cost) and effectiveness (producing maximum output for fixed cost) (Marginson, 1990) is the 'responsible' orientation in hard economic times. The impact of economic rationalist discourse in education has been to reposition the preexisting educational movements which were organised by the social relations of liberal meritocracy.

Cultural and democratic progressivism was already on the backfoot because of the conservative standards debate which countered the liberal progressive challenges of those disadvantaged by liberal meritocracy. Economic rationalism has marginalised those grievances still further. Equity, and even more, equality, are not central issues because the market logic assumes that there is formal equality between parties to exchange. Notions of citizenship are irrelevant in a world of producers and consumers. The old notion of a public good is meaningless when only private goods are recognised and when democratic public service is considered to be a self-interested protectionist power play by coercive bureaucrats. The ground from which a democratic educational project, concerned with the public good of <u>our children</u> rather than the private good of my children, can be mounted has eroded considerably since the 1970s. Support still exists, but it is not organised, nor easy to organise when reductionist economism holds sway.

The marginalisation of the democratic educational project is compounded by the slippage of naive liberal support. Where in the 1970s, commonsense was informed by social democratic commitments, the naive liberalism converged with the democratic project. But now it moves along with the prevailing economistic commonsense toward a technical and pragmatic concern with efficiency and effectiveness. This leaves two major

tendencies, both articulated with economic rationalism, which are significant in current educational debate.

The first is the articulation of economic rationalism with cultural conservatism in the New Right. This is far from monolithic, and is currently showing signs of fragmentation (eg. Sheridan, 1991; Manne, 1992; Stone, 1992). However, there has been a long association around notions of markets because elite schooling has traditionally been private. Entry has been governed by capacity to pay; intellectuality and social leadership have been associated with wealth. These assumptions about social and economic difference, the naturalness of inequality, the appropriateness of differentiated and exclusive educational provision were contested by the neo-liberals committed to universal public schooling in the first wave reforms at the turn of the century (Seddon, 1989). But they were reconfirmed in the class compromise of liberal meritocracy.

One source of tension in this articulation is over conceptions of content. The technocratic commitment to science, maths and economics, the downplaying of content in favour of credentials which are exchangeable in the marketplace, and the relativist smorgasboard model of consumer choice sits awkwardly with conservative emphasis on 'cultural literacy' (Hirsch, 1987) and moral absolutes. Of course, the market model does put educational choice back in the hands of the family, but there is a question about what is on offer and whether a compromise can be reached over the range of educational alternatives available.

The second major movement is of course, the vocationalist training agenda which articulates traditional labor, commitments to state regulation and equity, with economic rationalism (Lingard, Knight and Porter, 1992). Again there is a traditional convergence here because technical education has been oriented to 'industry needs'. These needs have been defined in the practical industrial relations struggle between employers and workers over job demarcation, entry requirements, work conditions and pay levels.

Apprenticeships have been institutionalised in awards and effected through TAFE. As a result they have been protected to some extent from employer cost cutting and labour shedding, but they also impose strong parameters on educational practices within technical education. This is not to say that in TAFE there is a uniform industry oriented instrumentalism, but to recognise the power of the industrial relations machinery in narrowing educational practice. It is compounded because 'training' has been institutionalised as an opposite of 'education' in liberal meritocracy and this has confirmed an alternative aristocracy and culture. There are therefore subjective as well as major institutional differences between the two sectors.

The current educational debate is therefore increasingly polarised into two forms of economic rationalism: a conservative deregulatory approach which is enamaoured by the recent New Right policies in the US and UK and committed to an academic education; and a more statist, regulatory, market approach committed to vocational education. We stand between conservative economism and vocationalist economism.

Since the late 1980s the vocationalist training agenda has been proactive. It looks to the future to a time of economic prosperity and social harmony which can only be attained by better integrating education and training into the economy. 'Education' in particular, in schools and higher education, is presented as inefficient, ineffective, inappropriate and elitist. The training agenda rails against 'education' as an expression of its own marginalisation and class subordination in the liberal meritocratic settlement. In the name of modernisation and economic reconstruction it embarks on a universal campaign to colonise the postcompulsory years as the entry point to an integrated career structure which breaks down the dualism of education and training in a competency-based system. Unlike the educational ladder, it offers everyone the chance to climb the greasy pole, not just the intellectual elite.

The training agenda profoundly challenges the hegemony of the 'academic' and its preoccupation with students differentiated on ability. It is an anti-meritocratic campaign because all students work and all workers learn. 'Education' is not a privileged site of educational practice, it occurs everywhere. What must be made clear are the particular responsiblities of different sites of educational practice in a coordinated national education industry. And the question of who pays.

This vocationalist challenge has moved through a series of steps. The first campaign targeted higher education. It built upon universities and Colleges of Advanced Education's (CAE) role in professional training and attempted to redefine these as institutions for the learning of 'higher skills' within an system of education and training. The collapse of the binary divide made universities and CAE's equivalents in a single 'Unified National System'. This allows the universities non-training role - as bastions of liberal education, the definers of significant educational knowledge, and the pinnacle of the meritocratic system of 'education' - to be ignored or discredited as an expression of anachronistic elitism.

But the federal goverments challenge to higher education has been turned, and indeed, the problems of bringing higher education into an integrated, national educational and occupational career structure would seem to have been compounded. Firstly, the collapse of the binary divide has turned the old Colleges of Advanced Education into univerisites which in some respects has reduced government controls. Secondly, corporate managerialism in universities has increased the commercialisation of higher education, but also enhanced the quasi-sovereign executive power of Vice-Chancellors and there seems to be growing resistance to external intrusions.

Another campaign has centred on training and the development of competency standards by the National Training Board. One dimension of this campaign has led to the recognition of overseas qualifications and facilitated the portability of credentials

between States on a national basis. Teachers have benefited from this, but it has encouraged moves to specify criteria and standards for teaching and other professional performances. Interest in professional competency standards, professional knowledge and competency based professional training is growing in vetinary science, engineering and teaching. But the old elite professions, medicine and law, have eschewed this development.

A third campaign targets the postcompulsory years through the Finn, Meyer, and Carmichael Reports. Ostensibly these reports target the non-retention kids, those who fall through all the gaps between 'education' and 'training' and are the group most likely to end up as long term unemployed welfare beneficiaries. But increasingly this campaign slides away from the target group becoming a more and more universal restructuring of the postcompulsory years around CBT and organised as a series of alternative vocational pathways. It is a campaign explicitly oriented to wresting control of the postcompulsory years from academic ethos of the higher education guardians. As the Carmichael Report notes:

> The ESFC (Employment and Skills Formation Council) wishes to clearly place on record that attaining twelve years of learning in key areas of competence can no longer be predominantly directed at higher education entry (ESFC, 1992:14).

And,

> CBT (competency based training) is concerned with attaining and demonstrating specified knowledge, skills and application by an individual, rather than merely measuring an individual's achievements relative to others in a group.

> This aspect of CBT is a move away from a culture of failure, where some are stigmatised as failures, to a training culture in which each and every individual is challenged to meet or exceed specified standards of performance. This is also a departure from imputations of capability from measured intelligence.
>
> (ESFC, 1992:25)

But the postcompulsory years are the traditional enclave of academic education within social democratic liberal meritocracy. Increased retention has problematised this pattern, but has not changed the academic significance of years 11 and 12 as a preparation for higher education. The stage is set as a 'collision course between the industrial guardians of the training agenda and the old guardians of liberal meritocracy, the universities and private schools.

Probable futures

The generalisation of the competency-based training agenda depends upon practical politics. Perhaps most important is the capacity of unions to renegotiate awards through the industrial relations machinery within the framework of the competency-based educational and occupational career structure. But the institutionalisation of an integrated and flexible career structure also depends upon the negotiation of competency-based educational programs, credit transfer, the recognition of prior learning, and easy transfer between education and work with the guardians of liberal meritocratic education and training. And this is only the first step in a more far-reaching re-formation of educational practice embedded in the traditions of schooling, the education workforce and its professional ideology and organisation.

The training side is easy. Its guardians are the labour movement which now, at least through the ACTU and the ESFC, press the training agenda.

The education side is more difficult. State schools each have their own State/Territory governance and bureaucracies, but these are being tackled through

national policy measures and through State-federal relations, particularly funding and related trade offs.

The 'education profession' can be encouraged to conform firstly, through individual advantages deriving from award restructuring. This is oriented to increasing pay, but more significantly status, enhancing public recognition of a difficult job well done, career opportunities and social standing. Secondly, consent can be constructed through the control of training and access to the profession. The formation of a National Teaching Council controlled by the 'profession' is a significant development here. However, the nature of the 'profession' and who is ultimately in control is difficult to determine. Teachers are already disorganised and demoralised which makes an organised struggle for professional control difficult to envisage except through peak organisations which, like others, are suffering from their own crisis of representation. On top of this, the widespread naive liberalism amongst the education workforce seems unlikely to provide a sufficient base to resist vocationalism. It seems likely that there will have to be an alignment with a less instrumentalist movement if a defense of education is to be mounted. The probable candidate for such an alignment at this stage is cultural conservatism which is eloquent in its warm-fuzzy talk of 'liberal education'.

Private schools and higher education are less easily tackled because they have greater autonomy from government, even though they are in receipt of significant government funding. The National Teaching Council as a body providing national registration and recognition of teaching qualifications, together with the expansion of competency based professional training, including teacher education, may be significant entry points from which private and higher education can be turned. But this is far from certain.

Higher education has now begun to actively draw down the shutters on competency-based education and training in the name of guarding excellence. The

emerging solution is a new binarism of 'education' and 'training'. The first public broadside was mounted by the Vice Chancellor of La Trobe University at a graduation ceremony at Wodonga (20/3/92). He is reported as saying:

> Universities ... must assert loudly that there is more to their programmes than the provision of the facilities to acquire basic competencies ...
>
> It cannot be asserted loudly sufficiently strongly that three is just as much need for excellence as there is for competence.
>
> I fully agree ... that the TAFE sector needs support and that it deserves much greater respect than it sometimes gets for its vital contribution to education and training.
>
> Perhaps we should sieze the nettle now and style the TAFE institutions and some new universities with substantial TAFE components Technical Universities and set them in contrast to traditional universities in terms of mission rather than social status. Such a binary division could protect the vital training area and ensure genuine diversity of educational provision.
>
> (Osborne, 1992)

Behind the scenes the campaign continues. A background paper prepared by a Deputy Vice Chancellor at Monash University comments on the lack of involvement of higher education in the training agenda and notes that what is significant is the limits of reform. Will it stop at the door of higher education, albeit with implications for credit transfer, professional education and teacher education? Or will higher education be pressured to adopt a competency based training system itself? As West argues, there would be considerable resistance to the latter:

> Higher education is not simply part of the vocational educational system. Even though nearly all of its graduates work ... there is much more to a higher education than a preparation for a specific job ... Higher education students in all disciplines

and professions are educated to develop independent thinkging and to challenge conventional thinking and current ways of doing things. And employers, it seems, are not dissatisfied with the outcomes: higher education graduates have the highest employment rate in our society [!].

Given this tradition, and it is an international one, an educational model which draws its goals from a detailed specification of competencies required in specific occupations now, and drives the whole of the system from these competencies (as CBT does) is an anathema to the principles of higher education.

(West, 1992)

The ground it seems is polarising. There seem to be two options:

1. go with the training agenda with its instrumental training approach to educational practice in an anti-meritocratic project and its reductionist commitment to economism and measurement; or
2. go with 'education' with its partial 'academic' approach to educational practice and its commitment to a narrowly defined meritocracy, exclusivity and privatisation.

This dualism is a restatement of the choices of liberal meritocracy. The trajectory of practical politics seems to set the ground for a new class compromise for the 21st century.

Preferred futures

In the face of this polarity many democratic progressive educators have taken up the training agenda cause. Partly because it is opposed to a narrow social hierarchy of ability, while still recognising different levels of performance. But also because it seems the most fruitful basis for getting in first and tying up a new education and training

structure before the next federal election when, it is widely felt, a Liberal government will be returned, implementing a deregulatory policy on industrial relations, a market model of education and training organised as an academic vocational dualism.

These educators' campaign has been to contest the narrow instrumentalism of the training agenda, stressing its commitment to knowledge, to contextual understanding and its relevance for life settings which are additional to employment. But as in all those campaigns based on fear, what is ignored in the preferred 'new social democratic' model is its convergence with New Right proposals and practices. This convergence occurs because of the common framework of economic rationalism and a history of institutional and discursive compromises.

The probable future is that the polarity of 'education' and 'training' will be consolidated to restore a liberal meritocratic institutional and discursive setting, albeit in modified, modernised form. The progressive campaign to broaden the training agenda may well be partially successful in increasing the attractiveness of a credentialled, vocational alternative to academic education. But the danger is that in a restored polarity, a more widely attractive, expanded and relevant competency based strand will only shift the balance of academic 'education' and vocational 'training', making the former even more elite and exclusive alongside a broader, mass vocationalism. Such a solution would mean a retreat from even the contemporary practice of liberal meritocracy, a practice which already marginalises so many students in a distorting practice of schooling.

The training agenda rails against education as its 'other', but accepts the framing of liberal meritocracy which establishes 'education' and 'training' as ordered, bipolar enclaves. It challenges 'education' in terms of the pressures of an external milieu but does not challenge the institutional and discursive setting which constitutes 'education'

and 'training' as equally limited, but different, selections, organisations and distributions of educational practice.

Given the emerging polarisation of the educational debate, generating preferred futures is a critical task. If neither contemporary 'education' or its other, 'training' provides an adequate educational practice, then a third way must be sought. And it must not just take sides with 'liberal education' or 'vocational education'. Siding only confirms the polarity; it does not tackle the unease we feel with both options.

But generating preferred futures cannot just depend upon an analysis of today's educational context. It is not enough to attend to 'external' challenges and play them back into educational organisation and practice because this neglects the particular history, politics and social relations of schooling which determines the pattern of possibilities and limits on action. Nor is it enough to seek change in the current organisation of schooling as this leads to an equally blind, but technical reformism.

What is required is a thorough going sociology and social theory of transformation which attends to the place and contribution of educational practice. But this must be linked to a creative thinking of transformation. It requires in other words, a theory and practice of educational formation and transformation.

A research agenda

The literature on Central and Eastern European revolutions provides some valuable insights. It seems that the processes of revolution in Central and Eastern Europe are not dissimilar to the processes of restructuring in Australian education. Both are varieties of more general processes of transformation.

Reasserting the centrality of transformation is important in the current debate about Australian educational restructuring firstly, because it clarifies that what is at stake is a directional movement beyond the past toward an indeterminate future. Confirming this focus therefore begins to counter the political passivity which accompanies, rapid

change, swirling disorientation and a pragmatic retreat -- suspending the practice of reckoning in historical terms in favour of strategies couched in everyday terms which reconcile people to a collapse of structures in easy installments' (Kaviraj, 1984:234-5).

Secondly however, recognising that transformation is the key to contemporary politics of education poses a strategic research agenda. It is located in a longstanding research tradition which seeks to develop a social theory of transformation (eg. Williams, 1961; Moore, 1966; Gramsci, 1971; Buci-Glucksman, 1979; Fatton, 1986; Anderson, 1988; Sylvester, 1990). And it demands quite concrete research tasks: the development of an historical sociology and political economy of Australian education and training which will allow the strategic assessment of social circumstances; an analysis of the opportunities, constraints and contradictions within which practical politics might be mobilised; and a creative thinking of transformation to open up options and alternatives, but from the touchstone of a known past which gives a sense of direction and a basis for evaluation.

Notes

1. I have only touched the surface of the immense and rapidly growing literature.

2. This discussion is a summary of a longer paper (Seddon, 1992).

3. My concern here is not with these sectoral variations, although teasing apart these differences is an important strategic research task.

4. The notion of a class comprise or 'settlement' does not just assume that conscious agreements were made between individual or collective actors who acted intentionally toward some end. Rather, this notion rests upon temporary resolution of structural antagonisms and contradictions as well as voluntaristic conflict (e.g. Seddon, 1988; McLennan, Held and Hall, 1984).

Reference

ACTU/TDC 1987 Australia Reconstructed: ACTU/TDC Mission to Western Europe. (Australian Government Publishing Service: Canberra).

Anderson, P. 1988 Modernity and revolution, in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Eds). Marxism and the interpretation of culture. London: Macmillan.

Ball, S. 1990 Education, inequality and school reform: values in crisis! Inaugural lecture presented at King's College, University of London, October, 1990.

Buci-Glucksmann, C. 1979 State, transition, and passive revolution, in C. Mouffe (Ed). Gramsci and marxist theory. London: Routledge.

Callinicos, A. 1991 The revenge of history: Marxism and the East European revolutions. Cambridge: Polity.

Chapman, T. 1991 Interview.

Chubb, J.E. and Moe, T.M. 1990 Politics, Markets and America's Schools. Washington DC: The Brookings Institute.

Dix, W.L. 1985 Australian Industry - challenges for the future. Practising Manager, 6, 4-8, quoted by ACTU/TDC 1987 Australia Reconstructed.

Employment and Skills Formation Council, 1992 The Australian Vocational Certificate Training System Canberra: AGPS.

Fatton, R. Jr. 1986 Gramsci and the legitimation of the state: The case of the Sengalese passive revolution. Canadian Journal of Political Science 19 4, 729-750.

Freeland, J. 1986 A political economy of schooling. Geelong: Deakin University.

Gramsci, A. 1971 Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci. New York: International Publishers.

Hirsch, E.D. Jr. 1987 Cultural Literacy: What every American needs to know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Junor, A. 1988 Australian education reconstructed Arena, 84, 133-140.

Kalantzis, M. and Cope, B. 1992 The postcompulsory curriculum for students with special needs, in T. Seddon and C. Deer (Eds) A curriculum for the senior secondary year Hawthorn: ACER.

Kaviraj, S. 1984 On the crisis of political institutions in India. Contributions to Indian Sociology 18, 2, 223-243.

Kolarska-Bobinska, L. 1990 Civil society and social anomy in Poland. Acta Sociologica 33, 4, 277-288.

Lingard, B. 1991 Policy making for Australian schooling: The new corporate federalism. Journal of Education Policy 6, 85-90.

Lingard, B., Knight, J. and Porter, P. 1992 Schooling reform in hard times. London: Falmer.

McLennan, G., Held, D. and Hall, S. 1984 State and society in contemporary Britain: a critical introduction. Cambridge: Polity.

Manne, R. 1992 The future of conservatism, Quadrant 36, 1-2, 49-55.

Marginson, S. 1990 Productivity in education: measurement and improvement. Sydney: University of NSW Public Sector Research Centre.

Marginson, S. 1992 Economic rationalism in education. Paper to the 'Rationalising Australia' conference, Flinders University, February, 1992.

Mealyea, R. 1989 Humour as a coping strategy in the transition from tradeperson to teacher. British Journal of Sociology of Education 10, 3, 311-333.

Moore, B. Jr. 1996 Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and peasant in the making of the modern world. Harmondsworth: Peregrin.

Osborne, 1992 Vice Chancellor calls for a new binary divide media flash, Office of the Vice Chancellor, La Trobe University.

Petrovic, G. 1988 Philosophy and revolution: Twenty sheaves of questions, in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Eds). Marxism and the interpretation of culture. London: Macmillan.

Preston, B. 1984 Residualisation -- whats that? The Australian Teacher.

Seddon, T. 1988 Schooling, state and society: the federation settlement in New South Wales, 1900 to the 1930s. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Macquarie University.

Seddon, T. 1989 Coherence in the changing form of schooling, state and society: an analysis of Australian educational reform, 1901-07. British Journal of Sociology of Education 10, 2, 155-173.

Seddon, T. 1992 Context and Beyond: Studies in the theory and politics of schooling. London: Falmer (forthcoming).

Sheridan, G. 1991 The split in the Right. The Australian, 21-22 September, 27-28.

Stone, J. 1992 The future of clear thinking. Quadrant 36 1-2, 56-63.

Suny, R. 1991 Incomplete revolution: National movements and the collapse of the Soviet Empire. New Left Review 189, 111-125.

Sylvester, C. 1990 Simultaneous revolutions: The Zimbabwean case. Journal of Southern African Studies 16, 3, 452-475.

Szelenyi, I. and Szeleny, S. 1991 The vacuum in Hungarian politics: Classes and parties. New Left Review 187, 121-137.

Teese, R. 1981 The social function of private schools, in H. Bannister and L. Johnson (Eds). Melbourne Working Papers Melbourne: Sociology Research Group in Cultural and Educational Studies, University of Melbourne.

Walicki, A. 1991 From stalinism to post-communist pluralism: The case of Poland. New Left Review 185, 93-121.

West, L. 1992 Competencies, competency-based training, and higher education. Unpublished briefing paper, Monash University, Melbourne.

Williams, R. 1961 The long revolution. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Yeatman, A. 1990 Bureaucrats, Technocrats, Femocrats: Essays on the contemporary Australian state. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Yeatman, A. 1991 Corporate managerialism: an overview. Paper to the New South Wales Teachers Federation conference, Sydney, March, 1991.

Ziotkowski, M. 1990 Social structure, interests and consciousness: The crisis and transformation of the system of 'Real Socialism' in Poland. Acta Sociologica 33, 4, 289-303.

For Correspondence:

Dr Terri Seddon, Faculty of Education, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3168, Australia.